

Message

From: Paddack, Mark [mpaddack@eaest.com]
Sent: 6/4/2019 7:15:28 PM
To: kwymore@eaest.com
CC: Shewmake, Kenneth [shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Case 48266- Lane Plating - please reply
Attachments: SDG_MF9L00.pdf; SDG_MF9L18.pdf; SDG_MF9L37.pdf; SDG_MF9M20.pdf; SDG_MF9L44.pdf; SDG_MF9L99.pdf; SDG_MF9L36.pdf; SDG_MF9L61.pdf; SDG_MF9M04.pdf

Kim – please see below and the attached. I was thinking that since they will limit validation to two data packages, MF9L37, since it covers 10 soil as well as two sediment, and either MF9L99 since it covers 20 water samples, or MF9M20 because it covers 18 filtered water samples.

What are your thoughts from a data validation standpoint?

Thanks,
Mark

From: Shewmake, Kenneth [mailto:shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2019 1:59 PM
To: Paddack, Mark
Subject: FW: Case 48266- Lane Plating - please reply

Mark,

Do you or your employees have an opinion on what data sets should be validated? I'm thinking MF9L18 for soil and MF9L36 for sediment. Please let me know if you have an opinion on this.

From: Perez, Myra
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2019 11:33 AM
To: Shewmake, Kenneth <shewmake.kenneth@epa.gov>
Cc: Flores, Raymond <flores.raymond@epa.gov>; Humphrey, Marvelyn <humphrey.marvelyn@epa.gov>; Paddack, Mark <mpaddack@eaest.com>
Subject: RE: Case 48266- Lane Plating - please reply

Hello Ken,

Please select two of the nine attached SDG's for ESAT to validate.

Thank you and take care.

Myra Perez
R6 CLP RSCC
281-983-2130